



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/822,711

04/13/2004

Geert Maertens

2551-142

3676

23117

7590

07/27/2006

NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER

WHISENANT, ETHAN C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1634

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/822,711	MAERTENS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ethan Whisenant, Ph.D.	1634	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05JUL 06.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 25-59 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 58 and 59 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 25-27, 37-47, 50 and 54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 28-36, 48 and 49 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 08/256,568.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>03 JUL 06</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1634

NON-FINAL ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed on 05 JUL 06 in this application after allowance. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 05 JUL 06 has now been entered. **Claim(s) 25-59** is/are now pending.

2. The following rejections are made based on the Examiner's reading of the "Expert Report of Bruce K. Patterson, M.D. regarding the invalidity of Innunogenetics, N.V.'s US Patent No. 5, 846,704" filed 05 JUL 06 with the IDS.

35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that may form the basis for rejections set forth in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

or

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

4. The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical

Art Unit: 1634

Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 102

5. Claim(s) 25-27, 33, 37-46 and 50-51 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Cha et al. [WO92/19743 (12 NOV 1992)].

Cha et al. teach a method of genotyping HCV present in a biological sample comprising all of the limitations recited in Claims 25-27, 33, 37-46 and 50-51. Note at least for example Figure 4e of Cha et al. wherein probes capable of detecting five genotypes of HCV (i.e. GI-GV) are shown. Note also Dr. Patterson's report at for example pp. 14-22.

35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligations under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of potential 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 103

8. **Claim(s) 52-57** is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cha et al. [WO92/19743 (12 NOV 1992)] as applied against Claims 25-27, 33, 37-46, 50-51 above and further in view of the Stratagene Catalog (1988).

Cha et al. teach a method comprising all of the limitations recited in Claims 52-57 except these authors do not explicitly teach a kit. These authors do refer to a composition of matter in the claims (i.e. Claims 41-55) but fail to explicitly teach a kit. However, as evidenced by the Stratagene Catalog teaching, it was well known at the time of the invention to place the reagents needed to perform a nucleic acid based assay into a kit format. In addition, the Stratagene catalog teaches the advantages of assembling a kit, such as, saving resources and reducing waste. Therefore, absent an unexpected result, it would have been prima facie obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Cha et al. with the teachings of the Stratagene Catalog wherein the reagents necessary to perform the method(s) taught by Cha et al. are placed into a kit format. The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to make this modification in order to take advantage of the savings and efficiency afforded by kits.

REASON FOR ALLOWANCE

9. **Claim(s) 58-59** is/are allowable over the prior art of record because the prior art considered does not teach or reasonably suggest the method for detecting the presence of HCV type 6 in a biological sample as recited in Claims 58-59. In particular, the closest prior art Cha et al. [WO92/19743 (12 NOV 1992)] do not teach or reasonably suggest, either alone or in combination with the other prior art considered, the method

Art Unit: 1634

for detecting the presence of HCV type 6 in a biological sample as recited in Claims 58-59.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

10. Claim(s) 28-32, 34-36, 47-49 are objected to because they are dependent upon a rejected independent base claim.

CONCLUSION

11. Claim(s) 58-59 is/are allowable while Claim(s) 25-57 is/are rejected and/or objected to for the reason(s) set forth above.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ethan Whisenant, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-0754. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 8:30AM - 5:30PM EST or any time via voice mail. If repeated attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla, can be reached at (571) 272-0735.

The Central Fax number for the USPTO is (571) 273-8300. Please note that the faxing of papers must conform with the Notice to Comply published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989).



**ETHAN WHISENANT
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Art Unit 1634